

In the Drawings:

Figure 1, as shown by the replacement sheet attached herewith, now includes word identifiers.

Remarks

1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the application is urged in view of the amendments above. With regard to support for the Amendments, with reference to claims 1 and 12, the display device being in the form of an endless loop is disclosed on p.10, l. 20-23. That the printhead is fed by the driver circuit is disclosed on p.8, l. 30-31 and that it includes a plurality of electrodes arranged in one or more rows is disclosed on p. 12, l. 8-9.

2. In the Office action, page 3, point 4, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Eller et al. (US Patent Application No. 2006/0050012) in view of Lacayo et al. (US Patent Application No. 2003/0210240). Reconsideration is requested.

An amended claim 1 is filed herewith; in this claim the following features have been added:

- "whereby the display device has the form of an endless loop and the image is composed by a certain number of pixels"; this amendment is based on the description, page 10, lines 20-23;
- "a printhead, fed by the driver circuit and including a plurality of electrodes arranged in one or more rows, whereby the number of electrodes is lower than said number of pixels"; this amendment is based on the description page 8, lines 30-31 and page 12, lines 8-9

Amended claim 1 describes an electronic display device whereby an image is displayed on a non-volatile display device; the image is stored in local storage means and transferred from this local storage means to a driver circuit, feeding a printhead comprising a number of electrodes which are arranged in one or more rows. The number of electrodes is lower than the number of pixels composing the image and the display device has the form of an endless loop.

US Patent Application No. 2006/0050012 (Eller et al.) discloses an electronic billboard, controlled by a server. However, Eller does not disclose a non-volatile display, nor an endless loop display or a printhead as in claim 1.

Amended claim 1 is thus novel over Eller et al.

US Patent Application No. 2003/0210240 (Lacayo et al.) discloses a system for remotely controlling a distributed network of signs (displays). The signs are displayed on a bistable display material. The display is updated over a network. However, Lacayo does not disclose an endless loop display device or a printhead, as described in amended claim 1.

US Patent Application No. 2003/0146891 (Poliakine) discloses an electronic billboard, comprising a display device composed of an array of LCD modules.

The device according to Poliakine is thus of a complete different nature than the electronic display system according to amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 is thus novel over the cited prior art.

New independent claim 12 contains the same amendments as amended claim 1.

Amended claim 12 is thus novel for the same reasons as those put forward in relation with claim 1.

All other claims being dependent claims, they are also novel.

It can thus be concluded that the new set of claims is novel over the cited prior art.

3. The amended claims are also non-obvious.

The idea of making the electronic non-volatile display device in the form of an endless loop and using such a device in a centrally controlled electronic display system is not disclosed in the cited prior art. The same can be said of the use of a printhead as described in amended claim 1.

A combination of the documents of the prior art can thus not lead to the system of amended claim 1.

Taking Eller et al. as starting point and comparing the system of amended claim 1 with the Eller system gives the following differences:

- the use of an electronic non-volatile display device
- the endless-loop-form of the display device

- the use of a small printhead.

Only the feature relating to the use of a non-volatile display can be found in Lacoya and a combination Eller-Lacoya could lead to a centrally controlled display system having a non-volatile display device. The two other differences, the endless loop feature and the small printhead remain.

Claim 1 is not obvious over the prior art.

The same reasoning can be applied to independent claim 12.

All other claims being dependent claims, they are also non-obvious.

Given the above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's further and favorable reconsideration in that regard is urged.

October 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Peter J. Shakula
Registration No. 40,808
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, IL 60690-2786
(312) 214-4813
Fax (312) 759-5646